

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This case has been carefully reviewed and analyzed in view of the Official Action dated 3 August 2005. Responsive to the objections and rejections made in the Official Action, Claims 1 – 7 have been amended to clarify the language thereof and the combination of elements which forms the invention of the subject Patent Application.

In the Official Action, the Examiner objected to Claims 1 – 7 due to ambiguity of the terminology and several of the limitations having insufficient antecedent basis.

Accordingly, Claims 1 – 7 have been amended to correct the language thereof. Language such as “is relative” has been replaced with language describing the particular orientation of the structures being referred to. The invention of the subject Patent Application includes a motion sensitive switch, well known in the art, but which was described as a “vibrating switch”. Since the term “vibrating switch” is not a term of art, the claims have been amended to simply refer to a -- switch --. The claims have also been amended to insure that all of the limitations have proper antecedent basis. Therefore, it is believed that the objection to the claims has been overcome.

In the Official Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1 – 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Chang, U.S. Patent No. 6,584,695, in view of Peot et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,755,107.

Before discussing the prior art relied upon by the Examiner, it is believed beneficial to first briefly review the structure of the invention of the subject Patent Application, as now claimed. The invention of the subject Patent Application is directed to a laser alignment device of a circular saw machine. The alignment device includes a cover having a laser hole on an edge of the cover and a rectangular receiving slot. The cover further includes a fixing structure for securement to the circular saw machine. The laser alignment device includes a laser module including a base having a parallelepiped contour and a laser source. The base is fixed in the rectangular receiving slot. The laser source is arranged in the base and has an emitting portion aligned with the laser hole and devoid of a prism adjacent to the emitting portion. The laser alignment device further includes a power control-supply unit arranged in the cover and electrically connecting to the laser module.

In contradistinction, the Chang reference is directed to a laser alignment device of a circular saw having a laser generator 11 of cylindrical contour, as shown in Figs. 3 and 4. Whereas in the invention of the subject Patent Application, the base of the laser module is a parallelepiped that is received within a rectangular receiving slot and thus needs no alignment with respect to the laser opening 10 formed in the cover 1 of the invention of the subject Patent Application. Further, as shown in Figs. 4 and 5 of the subject Patent Application, the emitting portion 20 of the laser source 25 is aligned with the laser hole 10 of

the cover and thus the alignment device of the invention of the subject Patent Application is devoid of a prism adjacent to the emitting portion. While in the referenced system, as shown in Figs. 2 and 3 of the reference, the emitting portion of the laser generator 11 is significantly above the light permeable hole 19, and is provided with a prism, unnumbered, to direct the emissions from the laser source through the opening 19, as shown in Figure 3. Thus, like the prior art discussed in the subject Patent Application, the use of a rhomboidal prism to refract the laser emission reduces the emission output illuminating the work piece.

The Peot et al. reference does not overcome the deficiencies of Chang. The Peot et al. reference is directed to a miter saw having a light beam alignment system and like Chang includes a cylindrical laser module 68 and rhomboidal prism clearly shown in Fig. 11.

Therefore, as neither Chang nor Peot et al. disclose or suggest the combination of elements which form the invention of the subject Patent Application, and in fact teach away from the invention of the subject Patent Application, since they each require the use of a rhomboidal prism, their combination cannot make obvious the invention of the subject Patent Application, as now claimed.

For all the foregoing reasons, it is now believed that the subject Patent Application has been placed in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
FOR ROSENBERG, KLEIN & LEE



David I. Klein
Registration #33,253

Dated: 2 Nov. 2005

Rosenberg, Klein & Lee
Suite 101
3458 Ellicott Center Drive
Ellicott City, MD 21043
(410) 465-6678
Customer No.: 04586